



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

missed with bare mention in a foot-note. In the early history of Greece the new theories of Professor Ridgeway are preferred to "the undoubted error" of other views. The paganism of the Roman Empire gets fairer treatment than in most text-books, and the temptation to ascribe the fall of Rome to the vices of the Romans is successfully resisted. Such independence, refreshing even when carried to extremes, has, however, its limits. Professor West does not profess to be a special student of ancient history or to draw deeply from the sources. He relies for the most part upon such respectable authorities as Holm, Ihne, and Mommsen's *History*, and does not appear to have profited by the more recent histories of Beloch, Meyer, or Pais, or to have used many of the more special monographs and constitutional treatises; so that those who incline toward the newer views will find much to criticize. Chronological exactness, too, is sometimes attempted where it is unattainable, statistics of population are given with undue confidence, and there are various errors of detail which need correction.

As a book for schools the volume has many excellent features. It is uncommonly well supplied with maps, it has an elaborate table of contents, it abounds in references, questions, and suggestions for supplementary work, and its abundant quotations from good books encourage further reading. The style is clear but not always simple, and the author has not shrunk from using difficult words. In the reviewer's opinion there is too much of generalization expressed in abstract terms, and too little concrete description. Still, the problem of presentation is much more difficult in a book of this kind than in a narrative text, and it is more important to stimulate thought than to tell a pleasing story. The book is plainly the work of an experienced and thoughtful teacher, and cannot fail to prove helpful to other teachers and to the better sort of students. Much of it looks like strong meat for the average pupil in his first year's work in history, but Professor West knows the high-school mind better than does the reviewer, and if students of this grade are ready for his book, they will find it a useful aid to historical study.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

De Necessariis Observantiis Scaccarii Dialogus, commonly called Dialogus de Scaccario. By RICHARD, SON OF NIGEL, Treasurer of England and Bishop of London. Edited by ARTHUR HUGHES, C. G. CRUMP, and C. JOHNSON. (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1902. Pp. viii, 250.)

THE text edition of the *Dialogus de Scaccario* is doubly welcome because we have waited for it so long. The editors are three officials of the Public Record Office, who put forth their work "with some confidence" as an improved text. This claim must certainly be admitted, and the student of the book has now before him the various readings of the three manuscripts on which must depend our knowledge of what Richard son of Nigel wrote. The text itself as here published is a composite one adopting what the editors believe to be the best readings of the manu-

scripts together with emendations of their own and of other scholars. There is, I believe, no variation from the text as printed by Stubbs in the *Select Charters* which makes any change of great importance in the meaning of a passage, but we may now have the confidence which comes from knowing that we have the best there is, in fact that we have all there is.

If one hesitates to find any fault where there is so much to be grateful for, regret at least may be expressed that the editors did not see fit to develop at greater length that portion of their introduction which deals with the manuscripts and with the formation of the text, and give in some detail the reasons for the conclusions which they reach. A knowledge of the genealogy of the manuscripts, of their relation to a lost original and to one another, is so important to the user of a text edition, and a full understanding of the evidence on which the editor's results are based adds so much to confidence and saves so great an amount of time unnecessarily expended if for any reason the reader feels obliged to work out the evidence for himself in the at best imperfect way possible from a printed text, that several more pages might profitably have been added to the introduction to contain these points. Unfortunately the manuscripts do not seem to have made possible a complete genealogy, and yet one cannot avoid the feeling that there is here some unnecessary uncertainty, though possibly this feeling arises more from the editors' briefness of statement than from the facts themselves. The natural inference from the paragraph beginning on p. 2 is that the editors' final conclusion is that both X, the supposed original of C, and Y, that of R and N, "derive directly from the original text" with the possible existence of copies between them and the original. At the bottom of p. 7 they argue as if they had never said that X and Y probably derived directly from the original, but as if their first stated conclusion had been that one copy came between them and it. Theoretically at least, the situation ought to admit of something like a probable settlement of this question, which is of some importance as bearing on the other question of interpolations. There are fifteen passages in which the editors reject a reading which is common to all three manuscripts, and one at least of these, that on p. 136, where *quis* is read by all for *ciuis*, is interesting, though it may not be by itself conclusive.

It is a misfortune in this connection that the manuscript which is here called H, about contemporary with R, proves to contain no readings of value. The editors have apparently settled the question whether this manuscript is a copy of R or of R's original. The point is important to justify a more categorical statement than is made, but I understand their conclusion to be that H is a copy directly from R, though they refer without comment from their discussion to Mr. Hubert Hall's in the introduction to the *Red Book*; and his conclusion is that it is not a copy of R. Liebermann only says "perhaps a copy of R" in his brief note in the *Neues Archiv*, x. 594, and nothing more in *Ueber die Leges Henrici*, p. 11. If H were a third copy of Y, which is the alternative, then even bad readings might be of some value, but it seems definitely proved that

nothing is to be learned from it. In the readings on the first page of the text we have references to N² and N corr., and shortly after to N³, R corr., and C corr., but the introduction gives no account of the character or date of the work of the correctors.

Sixteen passages are bracketed as interpolations although they occur in all the manuscripts. In all cases, therefore, the argument against the passage is what may be called subjective. In the majority of cases it is that the passage interrupts the argument of the author. There will be room here, of course, for difference of opinion. For the longest of these passages, one of half a page on p. 63, the argument seems satisfactory, but for the important passage on p. 67 (I. iv. A.) it is hardly convincing. This is the passage in which the writer alleges the absence of all reference to the blanch-ferm in the Domesday Book as an answer to that argument for the early existence of the exchequer which is based on the fact that peasant holders of land know by tradition all about blanching money. The statement that the blanch-ferm is not mentioned in the Domesday Book is certainly untrue, but that fact hardly serves to prove to us that the author of the rest of the book did not write this passage, nor is it quite conclusive to say that the merest glance at the volume would disprove it when we remember that Bishop Stubbs in the last edition of his *Constitutional History* (I. 408, n. 1) expressly agrees with the statement. With the editors' second point, that the passage is not pertinent to the argument, we may disagree entirely. "The memory of the cultivators," says Richard, "only shows that the blanch-ferm goes back to Saxon times, not that the Exchequer does, but in reality the fact seems to be opposed to those who assert this because the blanch-ferm would certainly have been mentioned in Domesday Book had it been in use." All rejected passages are printed in the text and marked only with brackets, so that the student may easily form his own opinion in each case.

All chapter headings and chapter divisions are omitted from this text, and the editors conclude definitely that they formed no part of the original, but here also the argument is incompletely stated in the introduction and must be worked out in detail from text and notes in order to develop its full strength. Nor is it then entirely convincing. The editors say, "the body of the treatise contains one reference to a chapter heading" (I. x. C. "in titulo de libro judicario"), but so far as appears the reference at the end of II. ix. is rejected from the text only because it is a chapter heading, and the reference in I. vi. B. is not bracketed in the text nor criticized in the notes, while even if the phrase "in agendis vicecomitis" refers to the whole of the second book, this does not prove that no chapter titles existed in the original. Nor have I found any reference to the fact that while "R and C are the only MSS" containing the chapter headings, blanks for them all are left in N (Liebermann, *Einleitung*, p. 7).

While one is in a complaining mood, the notes deserve attention. It is hard to forgive the placing of them at the end of the text. This practice is excusable only in a book for popular use where it is feared

that the notes will distract the reader's attention. In a book primarily intended for the student it simply wastes time, and to this charge of wasting the time of other students, which the scholar surely ought to wish to avoid, the editors have rendered themselves doubly liable by not printing the page numbers in the notes in a type that will quickly catch the eye.

I would not be understood, however, to imply that the balance of the account stands on the debit side when it is all made up. We have far more to be grateful for than to find fault with in this book. The heaviest charge amounts to no more than to say that the editors have been too sparing of words in proving their conclusions. And even this does not apply to the historical portion of the introduction, which occupies 44 out of 53 pages and gives in detail the procedure of the exchequer, differing in some particulars from the account of the same matter given in the introductory volume of the series published by the Pipe Roll Society.

GEORGE B. ADAMS.

Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series. By WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D. Collected and edited by ARTHUR HASSALL. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1902. Pp. v, 534.)

FROM the point of view of the general history of England the introductions by the late Bishop Stubbs to the volumes of the "Rolls Series" which he edited are the most valuable of any in the series. They form almost a continuous history of England from the accession of Henry II. to the death of John, full of detailed descriptions of characters and events, and they also discuss in text or notes many important problems. It was a useful thought to put these introductions at the service of the general public by bringing them together in a single volume.

While, however, their mere republication as we have it here is welcome, it is greatly to be regretted that the editor should have confined his editorial duties within such narrow lines. A page and a quarter of preface and five pages of index include his entire contribution to the book. He has not added a note of his own, nor modified a note of the original. References to the best editions of particular sources in print at the time of the writing stand unchanged, though numbers of these have since been superseded by new editions. The bibliographical references are left in a form which is often deceptive, sometimes almost absurd, as in the note on the Pipe Rolls in print (p. 129). The entire literature that has appeared in the period since the original publication is passed over without mention, and the reader would never suspect from anything in this book that new light had been thrown on many of the problems discussed, or that in at least some places the author would surely have reached other conclusions, or phrase differently the statement of his views if he were writing now. It is detracting nothing from the great service which these introductions rendered in their time to the true understanding of English history to say that no one can regret their republication in this form more deeply than Bishop Stubbs himself would have